



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,679	01/14/2004	Zhaohui Gao	SJO920030057US1	4112
46917 7590 10/30/2008 KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP. ATTN: IBM37 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212				
EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L				
ART UNIT 2175		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 10/30/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/757,679

Applicant(s)

GAO ET AL.

Examiner

Sherrod Keaton

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing of 7-24-2008. Claims 1-29 and 51-55 are canceled and 30-50 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 30, 31, 40, 41 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arend et al ("Arend" 20030229848 A1) in view of Aureglia et al ("Aureglia" 20030188257 A1) and MandrakeSoft (Copyright 2003).

Claims 30, 40, 50: Arend discloses a device, method, a user interface and a program storage device readable by a computer, the program storage device tangibly embodying one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to perform operations for controlling how data is presented in a tabular display, the operations comprising:

presenting to a user a display having a view configuration widget providing a graphical interface object representing corresponding preconfigured filters (abstract; Page 3 & 4; Paragraph 33 & 34) Arend discloses a preconfigured filter.

Arend does not explicitly disclose having a matrix of rows and columns of selectable elements.

However MandrakeSoft discloses a 2 by 2 button which is a matrix of rows and columns for editing the display (Figure 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the 2 by 2 button in the modified Arend as taught by MandrakeSoft. One would have been motivated to have the 2 by 2 button because it provides a design choice for a possible simple and extended functionality for a preferred selection.

Arend also does not explicitly disclose including a preconfigured column filter associated with each column of selectable elements for filtering columns of a table for display according to predetermined criteria and a preconfigured row filter associated with each row of selectable elements for filtering rows of said table for display according to predetermined criteria; However Aureglia discloses a method for a spreadsheet and further discloses selectable elements and the functionality to have preconfigured rows and columns associated with them (Figure 2B-D Page 5 & 6, Paragraph 76 & 77; Figure 16; Page 8, Paragraph 122). Therefore it would have been obvious to provide this functionality of configuring and filtering of rows and columns in the modified Arend as taught by Aureglia. One would have been motivated to provide the selection and filter functionality because this improves the system by providing an exhaustive filter selection of rows and columns in a user friendly interface.

accepting user input to select a selectable element of said matrix of rows and columns of selectable elements to implement a combination filter associated with the

selectable element selected by the user to display a preset configuration of rows and columns of the table wherein said combination filter is a combination of the row filter and the column filter associated with the selectable element (Arend: Page 3 & 4; Paragraph 33 & 34) Arend provides the functionality to filter a table (rows and columns) to certain conditions as set by the user; and (Aureglia: Figure 16; Page 8; Paragraph 122) discloses the ability to filter column and row.

presenting a display of the preset configuration of rows and columns to the user (Arend: Page 3 & 4; Paragraph 33 & 34).

Claims 31 and 41: Arend, Mandrake and Aureglia disclose a device, a method, a user interface and program storage device as in claims 30, 40 and 52 above wherein the graphical interface object having a matrix of rows and columns of selectable elements comprises a 2-by-2 matrix of buttons. MandrakeSoft further discloses a 2 by 2 button matrix with rows and columns for editing the display (Figure 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the 2 by 2 button in the modified Arend as taught by MandrakeSoft. One would have been motivated to have the 2 by 2 button because it provides a design choice for a possible simple and extended functionality for a preferred selection.

3. Claims 32-39, 42-49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arend et al ("Arend" 20030229848 A1) , Aureglia et al ("Aureglia" 20030188257 A1) and MandrakeSoft (Copyright 2003) as applied to claims 30, 41, 52 above, and further in view of Luque (2004/0119749 A1).

Claim 32: Arend, Mandrake and Aureglia disclose an user interface and program storage device as in claims 30 and 52 above presenting to a user a display having a view configuration widget but does not explicitly disclose providing a drop-down menu, the drop-down menu having items selectable by a user for setting a view configuration. However Luque discloses a user interface for wafer data analysis and further discloses a drop down menu for selection of column and row dimensions (Page 5, Paragraph 61). Therefore it would have been obvious to having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a drop down menu for selection in the modified Arend as taught by Luque. One would have been motivated to have the drop down menu to improve user efficiency by providing a flowing display of possible selections.

Claim 33: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose an user interface and program storage device as in claim 32 above wherein the providing a drop-down menu further comprises providing a menu of row selections and a menu of column selections. Luque discloses a drop down menu for selection (Page 5, Paragraph 61). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a drop down menu in the modified Arend for row and column

Art Unit: 2175

selection as taught by Luque. One would have been motivated to have the drop down menu to show selections to provide quick visual display of possible configurations thereby improving efficiency.

Claim 34: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a graphical interface program storage device as in claim 33 above, wherein the providing a menu of row selections but does not explicitly disclose providing a selection for displaying all of the rows. However it would have been obvious that if the menu of Luque allows different row and column selections, to also provide selection that fell under any criteria for adaptation of the selection in the modified Arend because Official Notice is taken that it is a well known technique to provide a plurality of selection conditions for searching through data and is recognized as part of the ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 35: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a graphical interface program storage device as in claim 33 above, wherein the providing a menu of row selections further comprises providing a selection for displaying a predetermined configuration of rows. However it would have been obvious that if the menu of Luque allows different row and column selections, to also provide selection that fell under any criteria for adaptation of the selection in the modified Arend because Official Notice is taken that it is a well known technique to provide a plurality of selection conditions for

searching through data and is recognized as part of the ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claims 36: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a graphical interface program storage device as in claim 33 above, wherein the providing a menu of row selections further comprises providing a selection for displaying data relative to a predetermined time. However it would have been obvious that if the menu of Luque allows different row and column selections, to also provide selection that fell under any criteria for adaptation of the selection in the modified Arend because Official Notice is taken that it is a well known technique to provide a plurality of selection conditions for searching through data and is recognized as part of the ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 37: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a graphical interface program storage device as in claim 33 above, wherein the providing a menu of column selections further comprises providing a selection for displaying all of the columns. However it would have been obvious that if the menu of Luque allows different row and column selections, to also provide selection that fell under any criteria for adaptation of the selection in the modified Arend because Official Notice is taken that it is a well known

Art Unit: 2175

technique to provide a plurality of selection conditions for searching through data and is recognized as part of the ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 38: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a graphical interface program storage device as in claim 33 above, wherein the providing a menu of column selections further comprises providing a selection for displaying only predetermined primary columns. However it would have been obvious that if the menu of Luque allows different row and column selections, to also provide selection that fell under any criteria for adaptation of the selection in the modified Arend because Official Notice is taken that it is a well known technique to provide a plurality of selection conditions for searching through data and is recognized as part of the ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 39: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a graphical interface program storage device as in claim 33 above, wherein the providing a menu of column selections further comprises providing a custom selection for presenting predetermined columns. However it would have been obvious that if the menu of Luque allows different row and column selections, to also provide selection that fell under any criteria for adaptation of the selection in the modified Arend because Official Notice is taken that it is a well known technique to provide a plurality of selection conditions for searching through data and is recognized as part of the ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 42: Arend, Aureglia and Mandrake disclose a device as in claim 41 above presenting to a user a display having a view configuration widget providing includes being configured for providing a drop-down menu, the drop-down menu having items selectable by a user for setting a view configuration. However Luque discloses a user interface for wafer data analysis and further discloses a drop down menu for selection of column and row dimensions (Page 5, Paragraph 61). Therefore it would have been obvious to having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a drop down menu for selection in the modified Arend as taught by Luque. One would have been motivated to have the drop down menu to improve user efficiency by providing a flowing display of possible selections.

Claim 43: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a method, an user interface and program storage device as in claim 42 above wherein the drop-down menu but further comprise menu of row/column selection. Luque further discloses a user interface for wafer data analysis and further discloses a drop down menu for selection of column and row dimensions (Page 5, Paragraph 61). Therefore it would have been obvious to having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include menu for selection of rows and columns in the modified Arend as taught by Luque. One would have been motivated to have the menu to improve user efficiency by providing a flowing display of possible selections.

Claim 44: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a device as in claim 42 above, and further disclose wherein the menu of row selections further comprise a selection for displaying all of the rows. (Luque: Page 5, Paragraph 61) discloses menu and (Aureglia: Figure 16) discloses the multiple row selections (show all, time, etc.). It is well within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide a plurality of row/column selections in addition to what is provided in Aureglia.

Claim 45: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a device as in claim 42 above, wherein the menu of row selections further comprise a selection for displaying a predetermined configuration of rows (Luque: Page 5, Paragraph 61) discloses menu and (Aureglia: Figure 16) discloses the multiple row selections (show all, time, etc.). It is well within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide a plurality of row/column selections in addition to what is provided in Aureglia.

Claim 46: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a device as in claim 42 above, wherein the menu of row selections further comprise a selection for displaying data relative to a predetermined time (Luque: Page 5, Paragraph 61) discloses menu and (Aureglia: Figure 16) discloses the multiple row selections (show all, time, etc.). It is

well within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide a plurality of row/column selections in addition to what is provided in Aureglia.

Claim 47: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a device as in claim 42 above, wherein the menu of column selections further comprise a selection for displaying all of the columns. (Luque: Page 5, Paragraph 61) discloses menu and (Aureglia: Figure 16) discloses the multiple column selections (show all, time, etc.). It is well within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide a plurality of row/column selections in addition to what is provided in Aureglia.

Claim 48: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a device as in claim 42 above, wherein the menu of column selections further comprise a selection for displaying only predetermined primary columns. (Luque: Page 5, Paragraph 61) discloses menu and (Aureglia: Figure 16) discloses the multiple column selections (show all, time, etc.). It is well within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide a plurality of row/column selections in addition to what is provided in Aureglia.

Claim 49: Arend, Mandrake, Aureglia and Luque disclose a device as in claim 42 above, wherein the menu of column selections further comprise a custom selection for presenting predetermined columns. (Luque: Page 5, Paragraph 61) discloses menu and (Aureglia: Figure 16) discloses the multiple columns selections (show all, time, etc.). It is well within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide a plurality of row/column selections in addition to what is provided in Aureglia.

Response to Arguments

Argument of Claims: Applicants arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

4. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
5. First, Arend provides a filter functionality upon selecting a button which is the graphical interface object; and therefore provides selection for having a preconfigured filter in this case rows. Mandrake is disclosed to build on this selection functionality of

Arend by providing multiple button selections in a matrix that perform an action. In combination with Arend the action would be that of preconfigured filtering. The benefit of this comes from the fact the selection ability is better utilized by providing the user with all possible selections initially. Aureglia is now included to provide functionality of filtering rows and in addition filtering columns in a selection which improves a user overall filtering capability. These filter options allow for a plurality of set ups to be arranged as a preconfigured condition. Applicants argue a combination filter, but examiner understands this combination merely as the ability to filter certain rows while filtering certain columns which Aureglia clearly discloses as seen in Figure 18. This ability is shown to be selectable in that selecting a certain tab of Figure 2C or 2D, a spread will be provided to the user that has been filtered to retain certain rows and columns relative to that tab. If applicants have a different meaning for this functionality they are invited to include these claim limitations to further clarify. This combination with Arend now provides the functionality of row and column filtering.

Conclusion

Applicants' amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

10-20-08

/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175